

Likewise, petitioner was well aware that the prostitution ring was nationwide, and he worked with the ring in order to provide its services to others. In so doing, petitioner became more than a "mere customer" of the unlawful activity.

3. The Act explicitly applies to those who promote and facilitate illegal activity, and there is therefore no basis for contending (Pet. 10-14) that application of the Act to petitioner's conduct runs afoul of the rule of lenity or clear statement principles. Before the rule of lenity applies, there must be "a grievous ambiguity or uncertainty in the statute." *Muscarello v. United States*, 524 U.S. 125, 138-139 (1998) (internal quotation marks omitted) (quoting *Staples v. United States*, 511 U.S. 600, 619 n.17 (1994)). There is no such "grievous ambiguity" here because petitioner's conduct falls directly within the plain language of the statute, which proscribes the use of interstate facilities to promote and facilitate unlawful prostitution offenses.

#### CONCLUSION

The petition for a writ of certiorari should be denied.

Respectfully submitted,

PAUL D. CLEMENT  
Solicitor General  
ALICE S. FISHER  
Assistant Attorney General  
LOUIS M. FISCHER  
Attorney

DECEMBER 2005

---

the "cases do not by themselves prove the Travel Act must be limited to owners and managers." Pet. 15.